UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/809,586	03/15/2001	Brian M. Shirley	303.724US1	3931

7590 06/17/2003

Schwegman, Lundberg, Woessner & Kluth, P.A.
Attn: Dana B. LeMoine
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402

EXAMINER	
PHAN, TRONG Q	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2818	

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No. 09/809,586	Applicant(s) SHIRLEY ET AL.	
	Examiner TRONG PHAN	Art Unit 2818	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

 (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

 (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

 (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

 (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

 NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *see attached explanation*.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

 Claim(s) allowed: _____.

 Claim(s) objected to: _____.

 Claim(s) rejected: _____.

 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). ____.

10. ☐ Other: _____

Phan Trong

TRONG PHAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

ADVISORY ACTION

Applicant's response to the Final Office action of 3/19/03 filed on 5/27/03 has been fully considered but it is NOT persuasive to place the case in condition for allowance because of the following reasons:

A) Fig. 3 of the present invention does not clearly show the claimed interleaving connective relationship **in a strip arranged in a row** as recited in claim 2, for example, because each of the strips as defined in the REMARK of Applicant's response is seen to be associated with each of the corresponding column decoders 310 NOT with the row decoder 322;

B) Regarding the rejection of claims 1-60 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph:

The dotted lines as well as the double-headed arrow in Fig. 3 of the present invention are not seen to represent the feature of "the memory cores from two of the different ones of the plurality banks are **interleaved in a strip/row** with the plurality of shared sense amplifiers as recited in claims 1-60. Since they are associated with the **column** decoders 310 NOT with the **row** decoders 322. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-60 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, is still totally proper;

C) Regarding the rejection of claims 1-60 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohsawa, 5,970,016, in view of Morton, 5,159,572:

1) if the claimed interleaved in a strip arranged in a **row** which is intended to associated with the column lines or bit lines not the word lines, then, one shared sense amplifier SS/A in Fig. 1 of Ohsawa, 5,970,016, which is shared by adjacent memory

blocks (see lines 27-28, column 6), is obviously interleaved with two different ones of the memory blocks in a strip arranged in a row parallel with the column lines or bit lines

2) if the claimed interleaved in a strip arranged in a **row** which is intended to associated with the word lines, then, modifying Ohsawa, 5,970,016, by Morton, 5,159,572, is totally proper to render claims 1-60 obvious under 35 USC 103(a) as set forth in the FINAL rejection.

For all above reasons, the FINAL office action of 3/19/03 is sustained.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TRONG PHAN whose telephone number is (703) 308-4870. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on (703) 308-4910. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-4021 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

phanTrong

TRONG PHAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

June 12, 2003